Maine Child Safety Restraint Study 2023



Survey Research Center

Catherine Cutler Institute University of Southern Maine

September 2023

Acknowledgements

Authors

Survey Research Center

Robyn Dumont, Managing Director

Survey Administration

Survey Research Center

Robyn Dumont, Managing Director Margaret Gormley, Policy Assistant Clare Murray, Research Assistant Janice Avignon, Special Project Assistant Sharleen Garvey, Special Project Assistant Ruth Robbins, Special Project Assistant

Observer Training

Preusser Research Group, Inc.

Neil Chaudhary

Prepared for

Maine Bureau of Highway Safety

Cover photo by Alexander Grey on Unsplash

Contents

Introduction1
Methodology2
Site Selection2
Observations
Observation Days and Times4
Observer Training4
Weighting5
Findings
Overview6
Time of Day7
Day of the Week7
Weather7
Vehicle7
County
Age9
Appendix A: Maine 2023 Observation Site List10
Appendix B: Maine Child Restraint Laws11
Appendix C: Maine Child Restraint Observation Form15

INTRODUCTION

While the Maine Bureau of Highway Safety conducts annual observation studies to measure the compliance with seat belt laws among adults, it has not conducted a study to measure compliance with child safety laws for a number of years. Despite the challenges of measuring compliance with child safety laws, this study seeks to fill a gap and set approximate benchmarks.

Measuring compliance with child safety laws is more challenging than measuring compliance with adult seat belt laws due to a couple of factors. First, while every car contains at least one adult, the same cannot be said of children. It is harder to observe children because there are fewer of them on the road, and a rigorous study depends upon conducting a large number of observations to obtain a reliable point estimate. Also, ideally you do observations in many different locations throughout the state to be sure you are observing a representative sample of the population. This type of study, however, would be overly time-consuming and expensive.

Measuring compliance with child safety laws is also more challenging because while the law is straightforward regarding seat belt use by adults—all adults must wear one, full stop—the law is more complicated regarding what constitutes appropriate restraint for children. It depends on the child's age, height, and weight—attributes that are not easily judged during a brief roadside observation. The smallest children belong in a rear-facing car seat. Upon attaining certain milestones, they may be placed in a forward-facing car seat. Next, they graduate to a booster seat, and finally they need simply be secured with a vehicle's seat belt. Judging whether a child has attained all the attributes that justify the use of a particular restraint is not possible in the few seconds in which the child is available for observation. In lieu of this, observers instead attempt to judge just the age of the child.

Given these challenges, the rates obtained in this study are not meant to be interpreted as precise, statewide rates. They are meant, however, to serve as approximate benchmarks, against which future years' rates can be compared to determine if behaviors around child safety are changing. This, in turn, will help inform the Bureau of Highway Safety's efforts to educate the public concerning the states laws and the benefits of adhering to them.

1

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted by the Survey Research Center with the assistance of Preusser Research Group, Inc. (PRG).

Site Selection

The sites chosen for observation were selected from the twelve counties in which seat belt observations were conducted this year. These twelve counties (shown in the table below) were chosen because 90% of Maine's passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred within them in the years 2017 through 2019. (Excluded counties are Franklin, Knox, Piscataguis, and Sagadahoc.) These counties also comprise approximately 91% of Maine's population.

County	Population	%	# Sites						
Cumberland	300,776	24.4%	8						
York	210,486	17.1%	8						
Penobscot	152,211	12.3%	8						
Kennebec	123,293	10.0%	8						
Androscoggin	110,378	8.9%	8						
Aroostook	67,272	5.5%	8						
Oxford	57,807	4.7%	8						
Hancock	55,417	4.5%	8						
Somerset	50,424	4.1%	5						
Waldo	39,618	3.2%	5						
Lincoln	35,065	2.8%	5						
Washington	31,003	2.5%	5						
Total	1,233,750	100%	84						
Source: America Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05									

Because eight of these counties account for 87% of the twelve counties' combined population, more sites were chosen from these counties. Specifically, eight sites were chosen from these eight counties and five were chosen from each of the remaining four, resulting in a total of 84 observation sites.

Sites for each county were chosen from one to three towns/cities. Locations selected as sites were either selected because they were likely to have a high concentration of children in the

area due to their proximity to a pediatrician's office, a day care center, etc., or they were selected because of the high volume of traffic in the area. This approach balances the need to be efficient with the need to observe a representative sample. Logically, selecting sites close to high concentrations of children helps achieve a higher volume of observations quickly. However, adults may be more likely to restrain children correctly when they are destined for one of these locations. In order to mitigate this risk, additional sites were chosen simply for their overall volume of traffic.

Observations

Trained observers were instructed to scope out the vantage points along each site to find an exact position in which to stand. They were directed to steer clear of the actual entrances to daycare and school facilities in order to avoid attracting undue attention or suspicion. These exact positions were recorded on maps so any future observations can be made from the same positions. Some positions, those located at intersections, made it possible for observers to see clearly into vehicles on two different road segments (e.g., vehicles traveling east and those traveling north). This was allowable. The instructions given for this situation were that the observer should prioritize the assigned road segment. As long as there was traffic on that segment, it would be observed. However, if it was momentarily empty of cars, the other segment could be observed in the interim.

Observers were instructed to limit their observations to passenger vehicles and to exclude taxis, police vehicles, commercial vehicles, and delivery vehicles. They were likewise instructed to skip any vehicles that did not have at least one child on board. Each eligible vehicle was recorded as either *car*, *truck*, *sport utility vehicle (SUV)*, or *van*.

Up to two children could be observed and recorded on the form provided. In instances when there were more than two children on board, observers were instructed to quickly and randomly select two seat positions to observe. Next, they made a quick judgement of each child's age, based solely on the appearance of the child, not on the type of restraint used. To facilitate this quick process, observers were told to classify children as babies (less than a year old), toddlers (1-3 years of age), little kids (4-5 years of age), or older kids (6-12 years of age).

3

Finally, observers recorded the restraint type observed. Child safety seats are distinguished by the inclusion of their own 5-point harness, which secures the child at the shoulders and hips. These seats may be installed facing backward or forward, depending on the child's age and size. In contrast, booster seats utilize the vehicles existing 3-point seat belt. Some booster seats have a back and headrest, making them similar in appearance to child safety seats. (The visibility of the vehicle's seat belt helps distinguish them.) Other booster seats, however, consist solely of a seat component. Because the latter are difficult to spot from outside a vehicle, children in these boosters were coded as wearing seat belts. In summary, children were coded as using a *rear-facing child seat, forward-facing child seat, booster seat (with back), seat belt*, or *no restraint*.

Observation Days and Times

Observations took place from May 2nd through May 21st. Each observation fell into one of five time slots, as follows:

- 7:00 AM-9:15 AM
- 9:15 AM-11:30 AM
- 11:30 AM-1:45 PM
- 1:45 PM-4:00 PM
- 4:00 PM-6:00 PM

Observation lasted for 60 minutes, beginning and ending within a slot's parameters. This allowed observers to travel from one site to another. Some itineraries called for four sites to be observed in a day, while others called for five, depending on the county and the total number of sites selected. Thus, some itineraries called for skipping one time slot. When this was the case, care was taken to eliminate a mixture of time slots.

Observer Training

Observers were trained by Neil Chaudhary from PRG. The training involved written material, an oral presentation, and field practice. The field practice was conducted on Forest Avenue in Portland, near the SRC office. Results were reviewed for accuracy and consistency; no observers were allowed to begin until their practice observations met training standards.

Weighting

While an attempt was made to obtain more observations from counties with larger proportions of the population (more sites were chosen from more populous counties), this was not achieved, so data were weighted to bring the observations into closer alignment with the population distribution. Weights were created using approximate targets derived from the American Community Survey (Table S0101, 5-year estimates, 2017-2021, ages 0-14). Child weights were between .30 (Aroostook) and 3.57 (Cumberland), and vehicle weights were between .32 (Washington) and 3.52 (Cumberland).

It bears mentioning here that weights are often imposed to make a random sample representative of the population. This was not the intent here as the sample itself was not random; the weighting procedure merely makes the sample more representative of the areas that were surveyed. Findings are still skewed toward more populated areas in the counties observed.

	Childre	n Observed	Vehicles	Observed		
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted		
Androscoggin	6.9%	10.4%	7.3%	10.4%		
Aroostook	12.7%	5.4%	12.7%	5.4%		
Cumberland	6.8%	24.1%	6.8%	24.1%		
Hancock	13.1%	4.1%	12.3%	4.1%		
Kennebec	8.5%	10.3%	8.8%	10.3%		
Lincoln	3.5%	2.6%	3.6%	2.6%		
Oxford	7.8%	4.5%	8.0%	4.5%		
Penobscot	15.9%	11.8%	15.3%	11.8%		
Somerset	3.1%	4.1%	3.3%	4.1%		
Waldo	5.3%	3.2%	5.3%	3.2%		
Washington 8.6%		2.6%	8.1%	2.6%		
York	7.8%	16.9%	8.4%	16.9%		
	100.0% 100		100.0%	100.0%		

FINDINGS

Overview

A total of 1,584 individual children were observed for child safety restraint use. Ninety-seven percent (96.5%) of the children observed were restrained while 3.5% were not. A small proportion of observations (<0.5%) were inconclusive, i.e., observers could not determine whether occupants were restrained.

96.5% of the children observed were restrained

In addition to observing and coding individual children, observers also coded vehicles, which sometimes carried more than one child. A total of 1,403 vehicles were observed for child safety restraint use. When vehicles held exactly two children, both children were observed, and when vehicles held more than two, observers would randomly select two children to observe. In order for vehicles to be coded as *occupant(s) restrained*, both observed children needed to be restrained. If both were not, the vehicle was coded as *occupant(s) unrestrained*. Ninety-six percent (96.3%) of vehicles carried restrained children, while 3.7% carried one or more unrestrained children.

96.3% of the vehicles observed carried restrained children

These rates are slightly higher than Maine's seat belt use rate for adults in 2023, which is 94.5%.

Time of Day

Fifty-six percent (55.8%) of vehicle observations were made during the morning hours, and 44.2% were made in the afternoon. Vehicles observed in the morning were slightly more likely to be carrying restrained occupants, at 97.3% compared to 95.0% ($X^2(1)=5.20$, p=.023).

	Restrained rate
Morning (n=780)	97.3%
Afternoon (n=618)	95.0%
Total (n=1398)	96.3%

Day of the Week

Fifty-seven percent (57.2%) of vehicle observations were made on the weekend, and 42.8% were made on weekdays. Vehicles observed on weekends were more likely to be carrying restrained occupants, at 97.8% compared to 94.5% ($X^2(1)=10.442$, p=.001).

	Restrained rate
Weekend (n=800)	97.8%
Weekday (n=597)	94.5%
Total (n=1397)	96.3%

Weather

Eighty-four percent (84.2%) of vehicle observations were made during clear/sunny weather, and 15.8% were made during cloudy/rainy weather. Weather was not correlated with the use of child safety restraints ($X^2(1)$ =.193, p=.660).

Vehicle

Almost half of the vehicles observed (45.7%) were SUVs, a little more than a third were cars (36.1%), and the remainder were vans (9.3%) and trucks (9.0%). Between 94.4% and 97.7% of the vehicles were carrying restrained occupants, but the differences among vehicle types were not statistically significant (X^2 (3)=5.521, p=.137).

County

Child safety restraint use varied by county and ranged from a low of 72.2% to a high of 100.0% $(X^2(11)=165.366, p<.001)$. It's important to note that these rates are based on a non-random sample. The observations in each county came from just one to three towns within the county. Furthermore, these towns were chosen for their relatively high population counts in order to obtain enough observations to achieve statistical significance. If less populous (more rural) towns were chosen, the rates would likely be different. Also, any point estimate obtained from a sample has a margin of error. Thus, extreme rates, such as 100%, should be interpreted with caution.

Eight of the counties in which observations were made had rates that were statistically significantly different from the average (96.3%), and an asterisk (*) appears next to these counties' rates. The remaining rates, while different from the average, were not statistically significantly so.

	Restrained rate
Androscoggin (n=146)	100.0%*
Cumberland (n=338)	100.0%*
Oxford (n=63)	100.0%
Kennebec (n=144)	99.3%*
York (n=237)	99.2%*
Somerset (n=57)	98.2%
Waldo (n=43)	97.7%
Average (n=1397)	96.3%
Penobscot (n=163)	94.5%
Hancock (n=57)	87.7%*
Lincoln (n=36)	86.1%*
Aroostook (n=75)	81.3%*
Washington (n=36)	72.2%*

Age

The focus thus far has been on vehicles rather than the individual children on board, but here the focus shifts to children. Observers coded children as being *under the age of 1, 1 to 3 years of age, 4 to 5 years of age,* or *6 to 12 years of age* based on the appearance of the child. Children between the ages of one and three made up the largest category (33.2%), followed by those six to twelve (30.5%), those 4 to 5 (24.0%), and those younger than one (12.3%).

Overall, 96.5% of children were restrained, but this rate varied by the age of the child $(X^2(3)=42.272, p<.001)$. Not surprisingly, younger children were more likely to be restrained than older children. All of those judged to be under the age of one were restrained, as were almost all of those between the ages of one and three (99.2%). However, a smaller proportion of children aged four or five were restrained (96.1%), and yet a smaller proportion of those between six and twelve were restrained (92.5%).

In some cases, children were restrained but not in a way that appeared to be age appropriate. For instance, generally speaking, children between the ages of one and three should be in a forward-facing car seat, but a number of them (n=18) were in a booster seat, and one was restrained with the vehicle's seat belt. (*Note: See Appendix B for specifical laws concerning appropriate restraint.*) When looked at more closely, in terms of *appropriate* restraint use, the use rate drops from 96.5% to 92.5%. This may indicate a willingness on the adult's part to secure the child but a lack of resources to do so correctly.

	< 1	1-3	4-5	6-12	Total
Rear-facing seat	186	24	0	0	
Forward-facing seat	8	480	194	12	
Booster seat	0	18	135	22	
Seat belt	0	1	36	407	
None	0	4	15	36	
Total	194	527	380	477	
Restrained	100.0%	99.2%	96.1%	92.5%	96.5%
Appropriately restrained	95.9%	95.6%	86.6%	92.5%	92.5%

APPENDIX A: Maine 2023 Observation Site List

County	City/Town # of vehicles observed (weighted counts)
Androscoggin	Auburn (n=94)
	Lewiston (n=53)
Aroostook	Houlton (n=29)
	Presque Isle (n=47)
Cumberland	Portland (n=63)
	Scarborough (n=28)
	South Portland (n=247)
Hancock	Ellsworth (n=58)
Kennebec	Augusta (n=144)
Lincoln	Damariscotta (n=15)
	Waldoboro (n=9)
	Wiscasset (n=13)
Oxford	Mexico (n=42)
	Rumford (n=22)
Penobscot	Bangor (n=166)
Somerset	Skowhegan (n=57)
Waldo	Belfast (n=45)
Washington	Calais (n=36)
York	Biddeford (n=38)
	Saco (n=126)
	Sanford (n=72)

APPENDIX B: Maine Child Restraint Laws

Title 29-A: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC Chapter 19: OPERATION Subchapter 1: RULES OF THE ROAD

§2081. Use of safety seat belts and child restraint systems

1. Definitions. As used in this section, unless the context otherwise indicates, the following terms have the following meanings.

A. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (RP).]

A-1. "Belt positioning seat" means a child restraint system that positions a child on a motor vehicle seat to improve the fit of a seat belt on the child. [PL 2019, c. 299, \$2 (NEW).]

A-2. "Child restraint system" means any device, except a Type I seat belt or Type II seat belt, designed for use in a motor vehicle to restrain, seat and position children who weigh 80 pounds or less and that meets the requirements of the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 213. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (NEW).]

A-3. "Convertible child restraint system" means a child restraint system capable of positioning a child to face either in the direction of the front of the motor vehicle or the rear of the motor vehicle. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (NEW).]

A-4. "Child passenger safety technician with special needs training" means a person certified by a national child passenger safety certification program using a curriculum approved by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to provide instruction in the use of child restraint systems who also has special needs training provided by that program. [PL 2019, c. 577, \$1 (NEW).]

B. "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards" means the standards described in 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 571, in effect on January 1, 1981, as subsequently amended. [PL 2001, c. 585, \$1 (NEW); PL 2001, c. 585, \$6 (AFF).]

C. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (RP).]

D. "Rear-facing child restraint system" means a child restraint system that positions a child to face the rear of the motor vehicle. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (NEW).]

E. "Type I seat belt" means a lap belt designed for pelvic restraint of a person seated in a motor vehicle. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (NEW).]

F. "Type II seat belt" means a combination of belts designed for pelvic and upper torso restraint of a person seated in a motor vehicle. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (NEW).]

[PL 2019, c. 577, \$1 (AMD).]

2. Children under 40 pounds.

[PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (RP).]

2-A. Children under 2 years of age. When a child who is less than 2 years of age is being transported in a motor vehicle that is required by the United States Department of Transportation to be equipped with seat belts, the operator shall ensure that the child is properly secured in a rearfacing child restraint system or convertible child restraint system properly secured in the rearfacing position in accordance with the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions, except if the child is in a convertible child restraint system and the child exceeds the manufacturer recommended weight or height limit for the rear-facing

Title 29-A: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC Chapter 19: OPERATION Subchapter 1: RULES OF THE ROAD

position the child may be properly secured in a forward-facing position in accordance with the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions and the vehicle manufacturer's instructions. Violation of this subsection is a traffic infraction for which a fine of \$50 for the first offense, \$125 for the 2nd offense and \$250 for the 3rd and subsequent offenses must be imposed. A fine imposed under this subsection may not be suspended by the court.

[PL 2019, c. 577, §2 (AMD).]

2-B. Children 2 years of age or older and weighing less than 55 pounds. When a child who is 2 years of age or older and who weighs less than 55 pounds is being transported in a motor vehicle that is required by the United States Department of Transportation to be equipped with seat belts, the operator shall ensure that the child is properly secured in a child restraint system with an internal harness in accordance with the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions and the vehicle manufacturer's instructions except that, if the child exceeds the child restraint system manufacturer's recommended height limit for the child restraint system, the operator shall ensure that the child is properly secured in a federally approved belt positioning seat. Violation of this subsection is a traffic infraction for which a fine of \$50 for the first offense, \$125 for the 2nd offense and \$250 for the 3rd and subsequent offenses must be imposed. A fine imposed under this subsection may not be suspended by the court.

[PL 2021, c. 293, Pt. B, §5 (AMD).]

3. Passengers less than 18 years of age. Except as provided in subsections 2-A and 2-B, the following provisions apply to passengers less than 18 years of age riding in a vehicle that is required by the United States Department of Transportation to be equipped with seat belts. Violation of this subsection is a traffic infraction for which a fine of \$50 for the first offense, \$125 for the 2nd offense and \$250 for the 3rd and subsequent offenses must be imposed. A fine imposed under this subsection may not be suspended by the court.

A. The operator shall ensure that a child who weighs less than 80 pounds, who is less than 57 inches in height and who is less than 8 years of age is properly secured in a belt positioning seat or other child restraint system in accordance with the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions and the vehicle manufacturer's instructions. [PL 2019, c. 577, §4 (AMD).]

B. The operator shall ensure that a child who is less than 18 years of age and who is not required to be secured under paragraph A or subsection 2-A or 2-B is properly secured in a seat belt. [PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (AMD).]

C. The operator shall ensure that a child who is less than 12 years of age is properly secured in the rear seat of a vehicle, if possible. [PL 2019, c. 577, s5 (AMD).]

[PL 2019, c. 577, §§4, 5 (AMD).]

3-A. Other passengers 18 years of age and older; operators. When a person 18 years of age or older is a passenger in a vehicle that is required by the United States Department of Transportation to be equipped with seat belts, the passenger must be properly secured in a seat belt. Each such passenger is responsible for wearing a seat belt as required by this subsection, and a passenger that fails to wear a seat belt as required by this subsection is subject to the enforcement provisions of subsection 4. The operator of a vehicle that is required by the United States

Title 29-A: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC Chapter 19: OPERATION Subchapter 1: RULES OF THE ROAD

Department of Transportation to be equipped with seat belts must be properly secured in the operator's seat belt. Violation of this subsection is a traffic infraction for which a fine of \$50 for the first offense, \$125 for the 2nd offense and \$250 for the 3rd and subsequent offenses must be imposed. A fine imposed under this subsection may not be suspended by the court. A vehicle, the contents of a vehicle, the driver of or a passenger in a vehicle may not be inspected or searched solely because of a violation of this subsection.

[PL 2019, c. 299, §2 (AMD).]

4. Enforcement. The following provisions apply to subsection 3-A.

A. The requirements of subsection 3-A do not apply to a passenger over 18 years of age when the number of passengers exceeds the vehicle seating capacity and all of the seat belts are in use. [PL 2019, c. 299, \$2 (AMD).]

A-1. The requirements of subsection 3-A do not apply to a driver or passenger who has a medical condition that, in the opinion of a physician, warrants an exemption from the requirements of subsection 3-A and that medical condition and opinion are documented by a certificate from that physician. That certificate is valid for the period designated by the physician, which may not exceed one year. The Secretary of State may issue a removable windshield placard that is visible to law enforcement officers to a person with a certificate from a physician. A removable windshield placard is a 2-sided permit designed to hang from the rearview mirror when the vehicle is in motion without obstructing the view of the operator. The placard must be displayed by hanging it from the rearview mirror so that it may be viewed from the front and rear of the vehicle when the vehicle is in motion. If the vehicle is not equipped with a rearview mirror, the placard must be displayed on the dashboard. The placard must be identifiable as a seat belt placard as designed by the Secretary of State. A placard issued to a person under this paragraph expires when the physician's certificate expires. [PL 2009, c. 436, \$1 (AMD).]

A-2. The requirements of subsections 2-A, 2-B and 3 do not apply if a child passenger has a medical condition that, in the opinion of a physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant or child passenger safety technician with special needs training, necessitates that a different child restraint system be used to improve the safety of the child. An opinion rendered pursuant to this paragraph must:

(1) Be made in writing by the physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant or child passenger safety technician with special needs training;

(2) Recommend a child restraint system that would improve the safety of the child; and

(3) Explain the basis of the opinion.

The operator of a motor vehicle transporting a child identified in this paragraph shall ensure the child is properly secured in a child restraint system recommended in the opinion rendered by the physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant or child passenger safety technician with special needs training under this paragraph in accordance with the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions and the vehicle manufacturer's instructions. [PL 2019, c. 577, §6 (NEW).]

B. [PL 2005, c. 12, Pt. AAA, §4 (RP).]

Title 29-A: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC Chapter 19: OPERATION Subchapter 1: RULES OF THE ROAD

C. [PL 2005, c. 12, Pt. AAA, §5 (RP).]

D. [PL 2005, c. 12, Pt. AAA, §6 (RP).]

E. [PL 2007, c. 60, §2 (RP).]

[PL 2019, c. 577, §6 (AMD).]

5. Evidence. In an accident involving a motor vehicle, the nonuse of seat belts by the operator or passengers or the failure to secure a child is not admissible in evidence in a civil or criminal trial, except in a trial for violation of this section.

[PL 1993, c. 683, Pt. A, §2 (NEW); PL 1993, c. 683, Pt. B, §5 (AFF).]

6. Exceptions. Notwithstanding subsection 3-A:

A. A rural mail carrier of the United States Postal Service is not required to be secured in a seat belt while engaged in the delivery of mail; [PL 2009, c. 34, \$1 (AMD).]

B. The operator of a taxicab or a limousine is not responsible for securing in a seat belt a passenger transported for a fee; and [PL 2009, c. 34, §1 (AMD).]

C. A newspaper delivery person is not required to be secured in a seat belt while engaged in the actual delivery of newspapers from a vehicle or performing newspaper delivery duties that require frequent entry into and exit from a vehicle. [PL 2009, c. 34, \$1 (NEW).]

[PL 2009, c. 34, \$1 (AMD).] SECTION HISTORY

PL 1993, c. 683, \$A2 (NEW). PL 1993, c. 683, \$B5 (AFF). PL 1995, c. 65, \$A107 (AMD). PL 1995, c. 65, \$\$A153,C15 (AFF). PL 1995, c. 432, \$\$1-3 (AMD). PL 1995, c. 432, \$4 (AFF). PL 1995, c. 597, \$\$1-4 (AMD). PL 1997, c. 450, \$\$1-4 (AMD). PL 1997, c. 737, \$7 (AMD). PL 2001, c. 585, \$\$1-5 (AMD). PL 2001, c. 585, \$6 (AFF). PL 2001, c. 710, \$15 (AMD). PL 2001, c. 710, \$16 (AFF). PL 2003, c. 380, \$\$1-4 (AMD). PL 2003, c. 380, \$5 (AFF). PL 2005, c. 12, \$\$AA1-6 (AMD). PL 2007, c. 60, \$\$1, 2 (AMD). PL 2007, c. 295, \$2 (AMD). PL 2009, c. 34, \$1 (AMD). PL 2009, c. 436, \$1 (AMD). PL 2019, c. 299, \$2 (AMD). PL 2019, c. 577, \$\$1-6 (AMD). PL 2021, c. 293, Pt. B, \$5 (AMD).



APPENDIX C: Maine Child Restraint Observation Form

 20	19	18	17			16	15	14	13			12	11	10	9			
0	0	0	0	C		0	0	0	0	C		0	0	0	0	C		
0	0	0	0	н	YEH	0	0	0	0	-	VEH	0	0	0	0	-	VEH	
0	0	0	0	s	VEHICLE	0	0	0	0	s	VEHICLE	0	0	0	0	s	VEHICLE	
0	0	0	0	<		0	0	0	0	<		0	0	0	0	<		
0	0	0	0	Δ		0	0	0	0	Δ		0	0	0	0	Δ		
0	0	0	0	1-3	Þ	0	0	0	0	1-3	Þ	0	0	0	0	1-3	A	
0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	
0	0	0	0	6-12		0	0	0	0	6-12		0	0	0	0	6-12		
0	0	0	0	R		0	0	0	0	찌		0	0	0	0	R		DRIVER SIDE
0	0	0	0	т		0	0	0	0	т		0	0	0	0	т		r side
0	0	0	0	B	RESTI	0	0	0	0	œ	RESTI	0	0	0	0	B	REST	m
0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	
0	0	0	0	z	2	0	0	0	0	z		0	0	0	0	z		
0	0	0	0	·-J		0	0	0	0	J		0	0	0	0	·-J		
0	0	0	0	Δ		0	0	0	0	Δ		0	0	0	0	Δ		
0	0	0	0	1-3	A	0	0	0	0	1-3	A	0	0	0	0	1-3	A	
0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	0	0	0	0	4-5	AGE	
0	0	0	0	6-12		0	0	0	0	6-12		0	0	0	0	6-12		ΡA
0	0	0	0	₽		0	0	0	0	찌		0	0	0	0	R		PASSENGER
0	0	0	0	п		0	0	0	0	п		0	0	0	0	т		GER SI
0	0	0	0	B	RESTI	0	0	0	0	œ	RESTI	0	0	0	0	B	REST	SIDE
0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	0	0	0	0	s	RESTRAINT	
0	0	0	0	z	22	0	0	0	0	z	073	0	0	0	0	z	~	
0	0	0	0	·.7		0	0	0	0	·-J		0	0	0	0	·~		

About the Survey Research Center

The Survey Research Center provides technical expertise and assistance to support the generation, processing, and analysis of quantitative data in the social sciences, human services, and public opinion fields. The Center provides a wide range of research and technical assistance services to federal, state, and municipal governments, private nonprofit agencies, businesses, and University faculty and departments. Services include proposal preparation, market research, needs assessments, program evaluation, policy analysis, and information system design.

About the Catherine Cutler Institute

The Catherine Cutler Institute for Health and Social Policy at the Muskie School of Public Service is dedicated to developing innovative, evidence-informed, and practical approaches to pressing health and social challenges faced by individuals, families, and communities.

About the Muskie School of Public Service

The Muskie School of Public Service is Maine's distinguished public policy school, combining an extensive applied research and technical assistance portfolio with rigorous undergraduate and graduate degree programs in geography-anthropology; policy, planning, and management (MPPM); and public health (MPH). The school is nationally recognized for applying innovative knowledge to critical issues in the fields of sustainable development and health and human service policy and management and is home to the Catherine Cutler Institute for Health and Social Policy.

